

REMARKS

The Examiner has objected to the title, drawings, specification, and claims. Such objections are deemed to be avoided by virtue of the clarifications made hereinabove.

The Examiner has further rejected Claims 1-5, 7-11, and 13-18 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Ito (USPN 6,243,675). Applicant respectfully disagrees with such rejection, especially in view of the amendments made hereinabove. Specifically, the subject matter of Claim 2 et al. has been incorporated into each of the independent claims.

The Examiner has relied on the following excerpt from Ito to make a prior art showing of applicant's claimed "wherein the current location is determined utilizing the speech recognition process" (see former Claim 2 which has been incorporated into each of the independent claims).

"The speech control unit 11 compares an input speech of a user supplied from the microphone 22a by way of the speech input control unit 22 with a word stored in the dictionaries 31 to 33 of the speech dictionary memory 30 to determine the similarities. For example, when the input speech is "Konnichiwa" as shown in FIG. 2, the language is identified as Japanese because the input speech is identified to be identical with the word "Konnichiwa" stored in the Japanese language dictionary 31." (col. 4, lines 52-58)

Such excerpt and the remaining Ito reference, however, merely suggests the determination of a *language* utilizing a speech recognition process. There is simply no disclosure, teaching, or suggestion of any sort of determination of a *current location of a user* utilizing a speech recognition process. Thus, only applicant teaches and claims a technique whereby a user may utter a location (i.e. "Sunnyvale, California"), so that a speech recognition process can determine such location.

The Examiner is reminded that a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Moreover, the identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as contained in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.* 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim.

This criterion has simply not been met by the Ito reference, in view of the foregoing distinctions pointed out above.

The Examiner has further rejected the Claims 1, 6, 7, 12, 13, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zlatsin et al. (USPN 6,377,296) in view of Gao et al. (USPN 6,073,096). Again, applicant respectfully disagrees, especially in view of the limitations of Claim 2 which have been incorporated into each of the independent claims and deemed allowable for the reasons set forth hereinabove.

Still yet, in the spirit of expediting the prosecution of the present application and bringing a close to prosecution, applicant has further amended each of the independent claims to include the following subject matter believed to be allowable:

"wherein voice-enabled driving directions are provided by:

Docket: BVOC009

-14-

receiving a destination address utterance representative of a destination address,
transcribing the destination address utterance utilizing an address speech recognition process,
determining an origin address, and
querying a driving direction database for generating driving directions based on the destination address and the origin address;
wherein multiple databases are utilized in carrying out the address speech recognition process including a first database with a plurality of city names and associated zip codes, and a second database with a plurality of street names, where a third database is used for validation purposes;
wherein a probability is assigned to at least one aspect of at least one of a plurality of grammars which indicates a prevalency of use of the at least one aspect, the probability being determined using statistical data, and the probability being used during at least one of the speech recognition processes.”

A notice of allowance or a specific prior art showing of each of the foregoing claim limitations, in combination with the remaining claim elements is respectfully requested.

Even still, applicant brings to the Examiner’s attention the following claims added above, and which include subject matter believed to be allowable:

19. (New) The method as recited in claim 1, wherein the origin address is determined utilizing the address speech recognition process.
20. (New) The method as recited in claim 1, wherein the address speech recognition process includes querying the driving direction database based on the origin address.

21. (New) The method as recited in claim 20, wherein the driving direction database queried by the address speech recognition process includes grammars representative of addresses local to the origin address.
22. (New) The method as recited in claim 21, wherein the addresses include street names.
23. (New) The method as recited in claim 1, wherein voice-enabled flight information is provided by:
receiving a flight utterance representative of a flight identifier,
transcribing the flight utterance utilizing a flight utterance speech recognition process, and
querying a flight information database for generating flight information based on the flight identifier.
24. (New) The method as recited in claim 23, wherein the flight information includes a time of arrival of the flight.
25. (New) The method as recited in claim 23, wherein the flight information includes a flight number.
26. (New) The method as recited in claim 1, wherein at least one of the speech recognition processes uses heterogeneous protocols by:
querying one of a plurality of databases of different types including static, dynamic, web server, and file system, and
dynamically retrieving grammars utilizing protocols based on the type of the database.

27. (New) The method as recited in claim 26, wherein the at least one speech recognition process uses heterogeneous protocols by:
determining whether the grammars are retrieved from a first one of the databases during a first attempt, and
retrieving the grammars from a second one of the databases upon the failure of the first attempt.
28. (New) A system capable of carrying out the method of claim 1.
30. (New) A method for providing localized content, comprising:
receiving from a user a content utterance representative of content;
transcribing the content utterance utilizing a content speech recognition process;
determining a current location of the user; and
querying a content database for retrieving the content based on the transcribed content utterance and the current location;
wherein the current location is determined utilizing a current location speech recognition process;
wherein voice-enabled driving directions are provided by:
receiving a destination address utterance representative of a destination address,
transcribing the destination address utterance utilizing an address speech recognition process,
determining an origin address, and
querying a driving direction database for generating driving directions based on the destination address and the origin address;
wherein multiple databases are utilized in carrying out the address speech recognition process including a first database with a plurality of city names and associated zip codes, and a second database with a plurality of street names,

where a third database is used for validating at least one of the origin address and the destination address;

wherein a probability is assigned to at least one aspect of at least one of a plurality of grammars which indicates a prevalency of use of the at least one aspect, the probability being determined using statistical data corresponding to use of streets, and the destination address utterance being matched with one of the grammars in the driving direction database based at least in part on the probability;

wherein voice-enabled flight information is provided by:

- receiving a flight utterance representative of a flight identifier,
- transcribing the flight utterance utilizing a flight utterance speech recognition process, and
- querying a flight information database for generating flight information based on the flight identifier;

where the flight information includes a time of arrival of the flight, and a flight number.

Again, a notice of allowance or a specific prior art showing of each of the foregoing claim limitations, in combination with the remaining claim elements is respectfully requested.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at (408) 505-5100. The

Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1351 (Order No. BVOCP009).

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin J. Zilka
Registration No. 41,429

P.O. Box 721120
San Jose, CA 95172-1120
408-505-5100

Docket: BVOCP009

-19-